

The problem is not new. Over the past decade, the United States has endowed nearly 60 nations with more than \$20 billion worth of military hardware, ranging from revolvers to missiles. The recipient countries have all vowed, among other conditions, to use American weapons only for defensive purposes.

Yet several foreign governments, measuring their defense needs by their own yardsticks, have betrayed U.S. objectives. And the United States, though disclaiming guilt, has often borne the onus for the ill-advised actions of its allies.

Here is a partial catalog of U.S. embarrassments:

American material delivered to the French under North Atlantic Treaty agreements was wielded against Algerian nationalists, thereby creating the pervasive impression in Africa that the United States supported French policy.

American weapons given to Portugal under NATO accords were used to repress Angola insurgents.

In Cyprus, both Greeks and Turks reinforced their positions with U.S. equipment—which they will undoubtedly also employ if they attack each other.

American tanks rumbling through Latin American capitals have served to overthrow governments painfully nurtured by the United States.

American aid weapons supplied to the Chinese Nationalists were surreptitiously shipped to remnant Kuomintang guerrillas in North Burma in an apparent effort to exacerbate a tense situation in southeast Asia in late 1960.

American-armed South Vietnamese police under the late president Ngo Dinh Diem's regime transported Buddhists and students to jail in American trucks bearing the U.S. handclasp emblem.

In aiding India and Pakistan, the United States tacitly acknowledged that military assistance might ignite an explosion. The program to build up Pakistan's armed force, initiated in 1954, was accompanied by an assurance to India that the United States would take appropriate action if American weapons were used against her. American military aid to India, started in 1962, was clearly earmarked for "defense against outright Chinese aggression."

Since then, Pakistan's \$1.2 billion worth of U.S. military material has included Patton and Sherman tanks as well as the latest F-104 jet fighters equipped with Sidewinder missiles. India's far more modest allocation—an estimated \$80 million—has largely consisted of communications equipment, ammunition, blankets, and weapons for mountain warfare.

Now and again in the past, lone voices pointed to the volatile nature of the Indian subcontinent. As far back as the mid-1950's, Ambassador to India Chester Bowles argued that military aid to Pakistan would heighten the danger of conflict. As recently as last March, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, warned that continued military assistance to both India and Pakistan "increases the possibility of war between them."

Now that wars have erupted, the United States has taken some forms of appropriate action. It has halted the ships carrying additional American hardware to the subcontinent. It is also using its military assistance treaties with both belligerents as a legal lever for diplomatic involvement in the situation.

But while a crimewave provokes loud appeals for law enforcement, the outbreak of hostilities in south Asia has inspired surprisingly little discussion about ways to limit the use of American weapons abroad. In some quarters, however, questions have been raised. Can the United States prevent the violation of its military aid agreements? If so, how? If not, why not?

The range of answers varies widely—and many answers generate fresh questions.

A critic of military aid who unsuccessfully tried to shave appropriation last June, Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat of Idaho, says: "I oppose the way we've institutionalized and globalized our military assistance programs. We should only give aid where the Communist threat is direct and immediate, as in Korea, Vietnam, or India when the Chinese invaded."

Unrealistic, counters a Pentagon official. "Military aid isn't merely providing weapons. Troops need training, and there's no time for that when the threat is immediate. There's really no way to control our arms abroad. Our hardware may be misused, but that's a risk we must take."

That Pentagon view, in turn, draws fire from a Congressman who complains that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara is now selling arms abroad "the way he used to peddle Fords." Besides distributing military aid, the Pentagon's weapons merchants—grandly called the Office for International Logistics Negotiations—have sold \$9 billion worth of military hardware over the past 4 years, thus stemming some of the U.S. gold drain.

About 90 percent of the Pentagon sales go to Western Europe. "If they don't buy from us," argues a Pentagon official, "they'll buy from somebody else."

To several officials, the proliferation of U.S. arms around the world reflects a lack of selectivity in American defense pacts. The United States actuated the creation of such groups as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) in the Middle East, hoping that its members would face the threat of communism together.

"But we found," submits a State Department specialist, "that many allies cared less about the cold war than about their parochial interests. We're observing now that Pakistan fears India much more than she ever feared China or Russia. Knowingly or not, we armed her to fight India, not communism."

For still other officials, the question goes beyond the use of weapons to the very issue of disarmament. "Our efforts at disarmament started at the wrong end of the scale," contends one expert. "Since World War II, rifles and machine guns have killed more people than our atomic bombs on Japan. We should be discussing the limitation of conventional weapons in disarmament talks."

"But so many countries that want the United States and Soviet Union to disarm refuse to disarm themselves. Maintaining armies lends them a feeling of strength."

Perhaps the Indians and Pakistanis would have never clashed if our military aid hadn't given them the illusion that they were strong enough to wage war."

DESCALATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, when it comes to Vietnam there has been a great deal of talk in the past of escalation. Now I am glad to see that the word "deescalation" is coming more in vogue. In this connection I must congratulate President Johnson and the administration in the unswerving, determined way in which they probe for peace.

Not only does he seek to deescalate, but just as we seek deescalation in the future in Vietnam, so that deescalation can only be achieved if the Communists also practice it.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times, which not only spells out deescalation steps that

have been taken, but by the very use of the term makes the word "deescalation" official.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESCALATION IN VIETNAM

For more than 10 years the United States has been following a policy of escalation in its military commitment in Vietnam. Now it has apparently decided to explore whether deescalation might not offer a more promising approach to a settlement of the southeast Asian conflict. The efforts Washington is currently making in this direction represent an invaluable addition to the numerous other peace feelers that have been and still are being undertaken.

The newest proposal, as Times diplomatic correspondent Max Frankel reports, is that Hanoi withdraw some or all of the 325th North Vietnamese Division it has sent into South Vietnam, in return for a reduction or cessation of American bombing of North Vietnam. This report clarifies the American offer of August 8—revealed in Britain's white paper yesterday—to initiate another perhaps more prolonged pause in the bombing as quid pro quo for an appropriate and commensurate military step by North Vietnam.

There is little reason, of course, to be over-optimistic about the new approach at this stage. No reply has yet come from Hanoi and many past attempts have failed. The British white paper details in 62 documents the innumerable attempts that have been made since February by London, Washington, and other governments to bring about talks. All have been fiercely rejected by Peiping and—occasionally after hesitation—by Hanoi. "Yet," as the official British commentary points out, "there is room for hope."

There have been a number of recent hints that interest in negotiations may be reviving in North Vietnam. Hanoi has admitted and held discussions with envoys from Britain and Ghana. Secretary General Thant, as reported in press dispatches earlier this week, has made undisclosed new peace proposals to the governments most concerned at the request of Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg.

The substance of a settlement—or at least its main principles—is being commented on by both sides in unilateral public and private statements so explicit that they virtually take on the form of preliminary informal exchanges. Thus, President Johnson on July 28 offered to discuss Premier Pham Van Dong's four-point peace proposals of April 8. And Ho Chi Minh replied in some detail on August 13 to probing questions put to him by the French scholar, Philippe Devillers, in a cabied interview published in Le Monde of Paris. The North Vietnamese President made it clear that, when the time comes, Hanoi would prefer an international Geneva-style conference rather than bilateral negotiations with Washington. He insisted that the United States actually accept the four points in principle before a conference is held.

For the most part, the four points merely summarize the key elements in the 1954 Geneva agreements, which President Johnson has said the United States also accepts as the basis for a settlement. There is one difficult sticking point. The Communists have added a demand—not in the Geneva accords—that the Saigon Government be reconstituted before elections are held. They demand a coalition regime in which the Vietcong would participate and even, in some versions, be given a decisive voice.

Negotiations, if opened, could go on for a long time. Militarily, both sides are digging in for a long war. But the increasing evidence that neither can win a victory by force of arms makes a political settlement essential. Deescalation would be the best way to begin.

TRIBUTE TO G. WILLIAM MILLER, PRESIDENT, TEXTRON, INC.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish at this time to pay special tribute to Mr. G. William Miller, president of Textron, Inc., whose headquarters are in Providence in my home State of Rhode Island. Mr. Miller has recently completed his 2-year term as Chairman of the Plans for Progress Advisory Council, which was developed through the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Mr. Miller has achieved remarkable success during his period of service as Chairman of the Council. He has brought his skills and talents, as one of our Nation's most eminent young business leaders, to bear on the deeply meaningful principles of equality in employment. He has translated these principles into reality for the betterment of our people and our country.

Under his leadership the number of major participating employers in the plans for progress program increased from approximately 100 companies to more than 300—a tripled rate of growth, now encompassing over 8½ million employees in manufacturing concerns, in retail firms, in banks and insurance companies, and in universities.

In commending him for his service, President Johnson praised Mr. Miller as an "industrial statesman," as a "resourceful motivator of men," and as a "far-sighted leader in the search for voluntary solutions to the unfinished requirements of a free society based on equal opportunity."

Vice President HUMPHREY has similarly praised Mr. Miller for welding into a "vital and lively program" plans for progress and for "extending its efforts and interests beyond equal employment opportunity to community relations, to training programs, to the quality of education available to minority citizens, and to relations between high schools and colleges and the business community." Mr. Miller has given abundant evidence of his public-spirited qualities in Rhode Island. He is a director of the Rhode Island Hospital Trust Co., a commissioner of the Providence Redevelopment Agency, and a director of the Rhode Island Research and Design Center, premised on the future growth and improvement of our State. Indicating his keen interest in Rhode Island cultural affairs, Mr. Miller previously served as a director and chairman of the fund drive of the Rhode Island Philharmonic Orchestra.

In my opinion he represents a combination of vigorous and imaginative business enterprise and dedicated public service—a combination of particular value to our country in these times and one which sets an exceptional example for others to follow.

I am delighted to bring Mr. Miller's achievements to the attention of my colleagues, and extend to him my heartiest congratulations.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article on the subject printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMPHREY PRAISES TEXTRON PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON.—G. William Miller, president of Textron, Inc., was praised by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for his dedicated leadership as the Providence man stepped down yesterday after 2 years as chairman of the National Advisory Council of Plans for Progress.

Mr. HUMPHREY said that under Mr. Miller's leadership the program to raise the economic status of Negroes and other minority groups had been made vital and lively, encompassing 313 companies in its equal employment opportunity phase and extending its interests beyond jobs to community relations, training programs, quality of education and relations between schools and colleges and the business community.

Mr. Miller said the program had made impressive and substantial gains toward greater job opportunities for Negroes. He said the number of nonwhite persons employed by the participating companies had increased by more than 100,000 and he called a 71.4-percent gain in salaried or white collar jobs the most impressive achievement.

From 103 companies 2 years ago, he said the number of participants had increased to 313 firms employing a total of 8,600,000 persons.

Charles E. Spahr, president of the Standard Oil Co., of Ohio, succeeded Mr. Miller yesterday as National Advisory Council Chairman.

NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO.'S "WHITE PAPER"

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a few days ago, the National Broadcasting Co. devoted its entire evening of prime program time to a sweeping and searching analysis of U.S. foreign policy since World War II. The marathon program, presented under the title of an "American White Paper," was an extremely interesting and informative presentation. It touched all of the great moments in world affairs for the last 20 years—the birth of the atomic age, the Marshall plan, the Berlin blockade, the Korean war, the Hungarian revolution and the genesis of the present crisis in Asia. The visual reconstruction of this turbulent era evoked poignant memories and at the same time gave new perspective to all of us who have lived through these events.

As the press reviews indicated, there are inevitable technical problems involved in the conception and presentation of a program of such vast scope and content, but it seems to me that these problems are of secondary concern. The real significance of last night's effort by NBC was the fact that a major network set aside the usual consideration of public response and attempted to give a serious and responsible treatment to a whole sector of history that needs to be considered in panoramic fashion. It was an excellent effort and the public is the better informed for having seen it. I hope there will be many more, but at this time NBC deserves the applause and thanks of us all for having ventured into the depths of a difficult matter. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jack Gould's review of the program in New York Times and also Bernie Harrison's review in the Washington Evening Star, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TV: FOREIGN POLICY—NBC DESERVES CREDIT FOR A GOOD TRY, BUT TOPIC NEEDS DEEPER TREATMENT

(By Jack Gould)

A network that cancels an entire evening's regular schedule for a 3½-hour consideration of U.S. foreign policy since World War II is bound to command respect for its earnestness in dealing with an issue of overriding moment. The National Broadcasting Co. did that last night in a marathon review of the country's international relations.

Robert E. Kintner, NBC president, gave the assignment for an exhaustive summary, just as 2 years ago he initiated a 3-hour evening program on civil rights. Fred Freed, producer, was put in charge of digesting in visual form the staggering volume of material on 20 years of world affairs.

Last night's evening was curiously history à la television. Each transpiring event from the explosion of the atomic bomb in 1945 to the agony of Saigon in 1965 was dutifully and methodically recorded, yet the total effect was strangely monotonous and enervating.

The mind boggled at the onrush of fateful happenings that tumbled out in all the superficial brevity common to the newsreel. The viewer was left with a gnawing hunger for some knowing editorial hand to exercise incisive selection, to give evocative meaning and clarity to the evolution of our overseas relations. History bereft of assessment and appraisal quickly reduces itself to a rewrite of headlines.

Not that "American White Paper: U.S. Foreign Policy" lacked potential value for the younger viewer, to whom events of the last two decades are only hearsay. It will be interesting to learn from the ratings how the evening was received, whether the program may have been too long for those who might have learned the most from the presentation, and inadequate for those who looked for meatier content.

There was a fitfulness of approach that was consistently disconcerting. It takes a quick study to absorb in hickety-split fashion the measure of the atom bomb, Churchill's Iron Curtain speech, civil war in Greece, the Marshall plan, the Berlin blockade, the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Korean war, European prosperity, Stalin's death, the Hungarian revolution, sputnik, the U-2 incident, the Cuban missile crisis, and De Gaulle's intransigence. And that was merely a third of the evening.

The second installment explored the role of the United States in confronting the emerging world with humanitarian aid and military might, a sequence that took in Guatemala, Lebanon, and Santo Domingo. It was the best third of the evening's presentation.

The last segment, on the other hand, was the least satisfying. To be sure, there was a speedy review of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, the dashed hopes of the United States in making China an ally, and the Korean war.

But NBC did an inexcusably cursory and hurried job in covering the details of the debate over American policy in Vietnam. Except for an interview with Norman Thomas, the opponents of the administration's policies were made to appear as videogenic eccentrics. The program's visual concern for battle scenes took precedence over all contemplation of the political, social, and economic future of Asia.

Where the NBC program had a chilling relevancy was in rerunning the miscalculations of high officials as to the duration of the Vietnam war, and in showing the remorseless process of escalation.

A 3½-hour program, out of which roughly 20 minutes was set aside for commercial messages, may require a new cinematic technique, some fusion of the raw events with a searching analysis of their meaning.

Foreign policy simply does not lend itself to police reporting of the what, where, and

nevertheless routine matters in international publishing. To survive, and to progress, management must look beyond the present to a hopefully better tomorrow.

It is obvious, when we stand back, that the penetration of English-language magazines in countries speaking something else is limited to the better educated and to those with broad curiosity. The number of such readers increases with the years as population and sophistication increase, but this still leaves untouched the minds of the majority. The question arises: Should we, as publishers, remain content with reaching only the leadership group, or should we publish in local tongues?

Our experiments along this line began 25 years ago with an attempt to put Time into Spanish. Translation was easy enough (although the Spanish ran 20-percent longer than Time's terse English) but the result was no longer Time. A North American frame of reference does not become a South American frame by being put into Spanish. It remains North, and seems inappropriate in Castilian. So the experiment was dropped. Some years later, as we've seen, *Life en Español* was born—and it was produced from the first by writers and editors born to the Latin frame.

Three years ago last April we announced a new approach to publishing in other languages. We formed an equal partnership with Italy's leading magazine publisher to produce *Panorama*. To the editors of this new monthly we offered the entire editorial product of Time Inc. After 2½ years of publication, the Italian *Panorama* has evolved as intended into a magazine for world-oriented Italians. Its editors draw from *Life*, *Time*, *Fortune*, *Sports Illustrated*, and the wealth of other stories in the file of our worldwide correspondents. They also develop material about Italy itself, thus combining in one magazine both the local and the global point of view—and all within the Italian frame of reference.

Panorama Italy fared well enough so that we have since started a counterpart in the Spanish language in Argentina. Though produced under the same governing idea, this *Panorama* is distinctly different—reflecting a different national point of view and the different personalities of its editors. We are now investigating other possible *Panoramas* in other languages.

Along similar lines, we are now copublishers in Japan of a business-oriented magazine called *President*. Based essentially on *Fortune* magazine, *President* reports on the stratosphere of world business as well as the toposphere of business, Japanese style. *President*'s great success in a country whose economic philosophy so closely approximates our own has led to investigation of other *Presidents* elsewhere.

This, then, is the American magazine overseas, at least it seems to my particular experience. I have been part of this fascinating business for 20 years and have yet to experience a single day when it did not offer challenge and opportunity. For here is not merely a business engaged in for profit. The vast majority of American magazines circulated in other countries are sources of information and means of education for those who read them. They speak facts, they entertain, they broaden horizons. They seek out, with complete disregard of national boundaries, like-thinking men. They establish communities of the mind whose members cover the earth. By contributing to understanding, they ultimately serve the cause of peace.

PARTICIPATION BY DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING AND BAYARD RUSTIN IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

MR. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement

I made concerning a development in international affairs over the weekend be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

A whole new sphere of troublemaking for the United States was launched yesterday when Martin Luther King, accompanied by Bayard Rustin, turned from his successes at creating domestic disorders to an attempt to play the same role with similar consequences in international affairs. It is a distinct disappointment to me and a disgrace to the country that Ambassador Goldberg would officially receive such persons as Martin Luther King and Bayard Rustin, and thereby lend credence to an appearance of official respectability of these two troublemakers.

Neither King nor Rustin have backgrounds or experiences which would even entitle them to an official audience. King is a notorious troublemaker and intermeddler, who has of late publicly revealed his interest in international affairs. Only King, and possibly some agencies of Government, can be sure what qualifications he possesses, or thinks he possesses, which would make persuasive his proposals to the leaders of communism to whom he proposes next to address them.

Bayard Rustin's qualifications are better documented in the public record, in that he was reported in the press to have been a member of the Young Communist League, not to mention the fact that he was convicted for sex perversion and dodging the draft.

It is indeed a sad commentary that even the existence of such persons is acknowledged to the extent of an audience with a high official of the Government. Ambassador Goldberg is, of course, free to accept advice from whomever he pleases privately, but I would hope that in the public conduct of his official position, he would be more discriminating and concerned for the image of our Nation than he demonstrated in publicly receiving King and Rustin.

AMERICANS UNITED ON VIETNAM

MR. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the results of a Harris Survey published yesterday give convincing evidence that the American people have rallied strongly behind their President over the gravest issue facing this land today, the war in Vietnam. Right now, as we meet in this Chamber, 66 percent of the public approves the course President Johnson is following in Vietnam. This support is an overwhelming repudiation of the Communists' wishful contention that deep divisions within the United States over the administration's southeast Asian policies will eventually lead to our ignominious defeat. In every region of our great Nation, the people understand the necessity for our commitment to the South Vietnamese. They understand that it is a commitment rooted in the desire for peace, and they support it.

Doubtless we will continue to have one or two misguided civil rights leaders issuing statements and isolated demonstrations against the war in Vietnam, but these actions are becoming less popular and, indeed, more futile every day. No matter how vocal they have been, the peacemongers have not been able to shake the commonsense of most Americans.

Those who oppose American involvement in southeast Asia have repeatedly attempted to swing public opinion

against the course being followed by President Johnson's administration, and have tried in vain to rally the people around several principal arguments.

One of the chief of these arguments is that we have failed to evolve a solid and consistent policy; that our goals have been hazy and ill-defined; that, in fact, we do not know what we seek in aiding the people of South Vietnam.

But in reviewing official public statements on Vietnam, one cannot help but be struck by the strong continuity of our policy as it relates to that beleaguered nation. Since 1954, when President Dwight Eisenhower pledged to "assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means," every administration has committed itself to aiding the cause of freedom in South Vietnam.

In 1961, the late President John F. Kennedy said:

We are prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and preserve its independence.

And President Johnson has said:

We have made a national pledge to help South Vietnam to defend its independence.

I know it is the President's intention to keep that promise.

Mr. President, almost every American official involved with the conduct of our foreign relations has taken great pains to clarify the aims of the United States in southeast Asia. Time after time, members of both Democratic and Republican Administrations have explained to the American people just what it is we are trying to accomplish.

In a June 1, 1956, speech to the American Friends of Vietnam, here in Washington, former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Walter Robertson outlined our goals in Vietnam as follows:

To support a friendly, non-Communist government in Vietnam and to help it diminish and eventually eradicate Communist subversion and influence.

To help the Government of Vietnam establish the forces necessary for internal security.

To encourage support for Free Vietnam by the non-Communist world.

To aid in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of a country and people ravaged by 8 ruinous years of civil and international war.

The roots of the conflict in southeast Asia extend back to the close of World War II and the emergence of a strong sense of nationalism and anti-colonialism in nearly every underdeveloped region of the earth. This surge of nationalism eventually swept France from her historic control of Indo-China and led to the Geneva Conference of 1954, which divided Vietnam into two distinct nations. Article 21 of the Agreement on Vietnam states that each party, North and South Vietnam, shall respect the territory of the other and shall commit no act and undertake no operation against the other party.

This provision has been violated by the Communists in Hanoi.

Since 1959 North Vietnam has been on the march. Unable to undermine and

September 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22707

What American magazines are now most popular overseas? They divide generally into three major categories: general magazines, news magazines, and business-professional-industrial magazines.

The most popular general magazine overseas is, of course, the Reader's Digest, which sells about 10½ million copies per month through 29 basic international editions in 14 languages. The Digest varies in content from country to country, but nothing is published overseas which has not already appeared in the U.S. edition. Since the Digest derives much of its content from other American magazines, scores of additional titles are thus given representation abroad which they would not have otherwise.

Reader's Digest is followed overseas (admittedly at some distance) by two international editions of Life whose combined circulation approximates 900,000 every other week. English-language Life International, printed in Paris, has the distinction of being the only general magazine specifically edited for a world audience. To the average 50 percent of content derived from material appearing in the U.S. edition, Life International adds articles and picture essays of cosmopolitan interest. It tends to be more literary than the Life we know here, and is generally more cerebral. The fact that it has found a distinguished audience wherever men are free to choose their reading matter attests to both the universality of English and to the existence of what I like to call "a world community of curious minds."

Life en Español, first published in 1953, has long since won a succès d'estime as Latin America's most prestigious popular magazine. It too derives perhaps 50 percent of its editorial content from the U.S. Life and creates additional material of particular interest to the Spanish-speaking world.

Popular Mechanics, appearing in seven languages, is bought each month by about 530,000 foreign readers who share the American penchant for learning how it's done.

Two service-club magazines of general interest have substantial circulation abroad. The Rotarian in English is read by some 80,000 families, and by more than 40,000 in Spanish. The Lion Magazine reaches close to 70,000 in English and more than 40,000 in Spanish.

Taken together, U.S. general magazines with international editions reach more than 12 million foreign families with a single issue. To these must be added the more than 1½ million foreign circulation of the regular domestic editions of scores of other general interest magazines. In addition to National Geographic, which leads the group, practically every favorite magazine here has fans abroad as well; Saturday Evening Post, Ladies Home Journal, Look, McCall's, Esquire, Seventeen, the New Yorker, Popular Photography, Fortune, Scientific American, and many others. A recent dispatch from Thailand reports that Playboy is selling like hot egg rolls in Bangkok as it does in most areas of the world.

The second major category of international U.S. magazines—and the category which probably exerts most influence on the attitudes of readers—is that of the news magazines: Time, Newsweek, U.S. News & World Report, Visión (in Spanish) and Visão (in Portuguese).

Time is the leader in the newsmagazine category, with a weekly circulation of over 800,000 concentrated among the most influential people of the free world. Time could be called an export magazine in the sense that its editorial content (except for the Canada edition, which has added local news) is identical around the world—and in Time English, too. It is printed in five foreign cities to speed distribution, but nothing is changed, added or deleted for foreign consumption. Thus Time readers overseas are almost literally looking over the

shoulders of American readers to find out what American editors think of the world that week—and, surprisingly often, to find out what's really going on in their own countries.

Right after Time come the international editions of Newsweek. Europe, Africa, and the Middle East are served by an edition printed near London. The Far East and southeast Asia are served by a Pacific edition printed in Tokyo. Canada and Latin America are served with the U.S. edition.

Like Time, Newsweek's editorial content is substantially the same the world over. Total circulation outside the United States exceeds 240,000 per week.

U.S. News & World Report does not publish international editions as such, but finds an audience of some 34,000 per issue overseas. Some copies are delivered by airmail.

Visión is a fortnightly news magazine in the Spanish language with particular orientation toward Latin American businessmen. It is printed both in Mexico and Chile and enjoys a circulation of some 155,000. A weekly edition in Portuguese, printed in Brazil and including special local content, has a circulation of some 65,000.

The last major category of U.S. magazines circulating abroad is by no means the least. So-called export business magazines (many in Spanish and most distributed free of charge) have a per-issue circulation in excess of 800,000. Other business, technical, and trade publications published primarily for U.S. audiences but "overflowing" abroad number more than 600 (from Adhesives Age to the Writer) and reach more than 700,000 readers abroad with one issue. And finally, well over 100 scholarly periodicals, led by those in the social sciences and the humanities, find an overseas audience of more than 70,000 per issue.

What accounts for this prodigious popularity of all sorts of American magazines in other countries? Many reasons, I think, and reasons varying by country.

In smaller nations where a local press has not been established, or whose orientation is perhaps a bit parochial, American magazines find readers because American publishers have been aggressive enough to make them available to help fill the homegrown vacuum.

In countries with a flourishing local press, American magazines seem to be bought for news and views of America, for general foreign news not available through local media, for the smart way in which American magazines are edited, and for the generally superior style in which they are produced. (Robert Benchley could hardly say today of any edition of Time, as he did of the first issues in 1923, that the magazine appeared to be printed on slices of stale bread.) J. S. Chaloner, manager of Britain's largest magazine distribution firm and a participant in the founding of Germany's famed Der Spiegel, passes along the view of a professional: "If the price of imported magazines is higher than the domestic equivalent, it must be said bluntly that far too often so is the editorial quality, the production, and number of pages."

The exigencies of distributing almost 3 million magazines a fortnight number scarcely less than 3 million themselves. The documents (invoices, bills of lading, customs declarations, etc.) necessary to cover distribution of single issues of Time and Life weigh about 100 pounds.

Time originates in six locations for foreign distribution: in Montreal for all of Canada; in Atlanta, Ga. (since Castro closed down our Cuban plant) for Latin America; in Paris for Europe, the Middle East and Africa; in Tokyo for the Far East; in Melbourne for Australia and, just recently, in Auckland for New Zealand. Time is printed in these cities by offset plates made directly from special film flown from Chicago. Distributed by air (we are one of the five largest users of inter-

national air freight) Time is in the hands of readers in all the principal cities of the world no later than the date on its cover and generally several days before.

Life International and Life en Español, printed on heavy stock, are delivered mostly by surface transport. Life en Español, printed in Chicago on the same presses that produce Life United States, travels by train to Mexico and thence by ship and truck to readers throughout Latin America. Life International travels from its printing point in Paris by air and rail throughout Europe, by ship elsewhere.

About half the circulation of Time and Life overseas is by subscription, paid for in some 30 currencies. There are banking and remitting facilities in every major country which enable the reader to order a subscription by writing a personal check on his local account.

In years past, getting pesetas out of Spain, pounds of England, zlotys out of Poland or most anything from almost anywhere was one of our most frustrating problems. At one time, I remember, we thought of buying Dutch guilders with exchangeable other moneys, using the guilders to buy Dutch cheese, then importing the cheese to the United States and selling it by the chunk to gourmets. Today our exchange problems are relatively few, probably the greatest of them being galloping inflation in much of Latin America.

Censorship and discriminatory practices have plagued us since Time first flew to Latin America in 1941. Mr. Peron, of Argentina forbade us entry for some 6 years—thus creating a flourishing black market in copies sneaked in from Uruguay. Mr. Trujillo of the Dominican Republic liked us even less than we did him. The late ex-King Farouk of Egypt banned us for lese majeste shortly before he was banished for much the same thing. Spain maintains two sets of censors: one operated by the church, the other by the state. Both frown on opulent ladies whether painted by Rubens or photographed by Eisenstaedt. Most of the Arab countries, refusing to recognize the existence of Israel, either ban issues with editorial or advertising content mentioning that country or set their censors to work with shears removing the offending pages. Ireland smiles on most that we offer, but grimaces at advertisements for ladies' undergarments.

None of our magazines, of course, is allowed to circulate in Russia, although a few dozen subscription copies go in to top officials. Periodically we are allowed to open a news bureau in Moscow, but it is ordered closed and our correspondents banished when they work too embarrassingly at their trade. Some of Russia's satellites allow us in for a time and then as mysteriously allow us out. In Red China Time has a circulation of one, Life of none, although the Government keeps the Winter Palace supplied by pouch from Tokyo. Mr. Sukarno of Indonesia has banned us since 1961. He disliked many things in Time's reporting, including the fact that he liked girls. He still dislikes Time, and there is still no evidence that he dislikes girls.

During the Algerian crisis, Time had a highly unfavorable cover story on General Salan, one of the dissenting French commanders who wanted to keep the French grip on Algeria. Salan was pictured in front of a desert, and in the sand was written his slogan: "Algérie française." When the cover came off press in Paris, the French Minister of Information, perhaps fearful that our cover would be misinterpreted as favoring Salan's cause—"Après tout, c'est lui sur la couverture, n'est-ce pas?"—caused us to block out the illustration with green ink before allowing copies to go on sale. Result, of course: a sellout but no insurrection.

Matters of censorship, distribution and advertising, complicated as they may be, are

September 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22709

topple the Government of South Vietnam by subversion, the Communists have embarked on a course of open aggression. They have infiltrated tens of thousands of guerrillas and vast stores of weapons into South Vietnam. They have sent several identified regiments of the regular army of North Vietnam into the South. They have stepped up their campaigns of terror and subversion.

The people of South Vietnam have resisted every attack bravely and with all the resources at their command. They have made great sacrifices in the defense of their liberty.

But, Mr. President, these people in a land 10,000 miles from our shores cannot stand alone. They face a strong and determined enemy who is supported by Communist China and other Communist nations. They were forced to seek help from the free world, and that help was extended by President Eisenhower and has been continued by each of his successors.

This aid has become the cornerstone of free world support for Vietnam. As the major free world power, this is a responsibility our Nation must not and cannot shirk. The history of America itself is the fulfillment of a dream against odds which at times seemed overwhelming. In the face of that history, we cannot abandon any free nation which seeks similar goals. Following our lead, 36 other free world nations are already contributing military or economic assistance to South Vietnam, or are pledged to do so in the near future.

Even while the forces of freedom have been increasing military efforts to counter the growing Communist aggression, we have continued our work in the economic and social fields. And, most important of all, we have again and again stated our willingness to enter into discussions or negotiations leading to peace and stability in Vietnam.

In his famous Johns Hopkins speech on April 7, of this year, President Johnson stated our readiness to engage in unconditional discussions with the governments of North Vietnam and other countries in an effort to arrive at an honorable settlement. He reaffirmed, however, that until such an agreement is reached, "We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom that we can command. But we will use it."

Mr. President, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated the essence of the Vietnamese issue as clearly as I have heard it in his press conference of November 17, 1961. At that time, he said:

The determined and ruthless campaign of propaganda, infiltration, and subversion by the Communist regime in North Vietnam to destroy the Republic of Vietnam and subjugate its people is a threat to the peace. The independence and territorial integrity of that free country is of major and serious concern not only to the people of Vietnam and their immediate neighbors, but also to all other free nations.

The Communists in Hanoi would have us believe Secretary Rusk's words are untrue, and that the conflict in South Vietnam is nothing more than a civil war between factions of South Vietnamese.

Regrettably, many of the domestic opponents of President Johnson's Asian policies have echoed this contention and have accused us of meddling in the internal affairs of another country.

The charge that what is taking place in South Vietnam is a civil war, however, is not substantiated by the available information. The Government in Saigon and our Government are in possession of a large mass of evidence from many sources which plainly indicates that North Vietnam is directing the war from Hanoi. Its commands are channeled through its military and political cadres in South Vietnam. Most of the weapons used by the Vietcong have been supplied by the North.

The so-called national liberation front is a child of Hanoi. Its member organizations are mostly shadows without substance. Its leaders are without political stature, and most of them are unknown in the South. Dr. Robert Scalapino of the University of California, who has long studied the problems of southeast Asia, said in May of this year that—

The real leaders of the Vietcong are, and always have been * * * members of the Communist Party—and that party has Hanoi as its headquarters now as in the past.

The South Vietnamese people, who have had long and bitter experience with the Communists, know these facts. But few foreigners do, and this is an advantage Hanoi and Peiping have been exploiting to the utmost in their political and propaganda activities.

Mr. President, the critics of our actions in Vietnam have raised one point that is the legitimate concern of every responsible American. It is the question of whether a war being waged in a tiny, far-off country will expand into a conflagration that will sweep the earth. For while the course of our involvement in southeast Asia has remained constant, its scale has become greatly enlarged as we have moved to meet the increase of Communist activity. Early this year, for instance, the administration began a carefully controlled series of bombing raids on targets of military value in North Vietnam.

The United States has repeatedly declared that we do not seek to destroy cities or the civilian population of the North.

What we do expect to accomplish through these air attacks was set forth by Ambassador Maxwell Taylor, our former Ambassador in Saigon, in an August 16 television interview. He made three major points:

First. To give the South Vietnamese people the sense of being able to strike back for the first time against the source of all their evils, North Vietnam.

Second. To reduce infiltration.

Third. To remind the Communists in Hanoi that unless they cease their aggression they will have to pay an ever-higher price for their actions.

No one can accurately predict when our soundly balanced strategy of air and ground military activity, logistical support and political flexibility will yield

concrete results, but yield them it will.

While no one can contend that the road ahead in Vietnam is short or easy, or that great dangers do not exist, the possibility of an eventual settlement seems nearer.

The propaganda of Hanoi and the National Liberation Front has moved away from the flat demand that U.S. Armed Forces get out of South Vietnam, and now we are hearing carefully worded suggestions that a token force of American troops might remain in South Vietnam while discussions were undertaken.

The Communists still insist on the fiction, however, that the National Liberation Front must represent South Vietnam in any peace talks, which is comparable to insisting that the American Communist Party represent the United States in some hypothetical negotiation with Communist nations.

Meanwhile, the monsoon season in Southeast Asia is drawing to a close, and the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese masters are no nearer to victory than when their latest offensive began in late May. This is not to say that the teeth of the Communists have been pulled, but American-led forces have dealt them some serious blows in recent weeks. We have bombed within 17 miles of the Red Chinese border. In addition we have demonstrated very forcibly to Hanoi that we can wipe out their rail and supply lines with ease.

The latest news reports filed from Saigon indicate that, as their frustrations on the battlefield mount, the Vietcong are turning more and more to methods of brutal terrorism in their drive for conquest.

Mr. President, the possibility of direct Chinese intervention in the struggle in Vietnam is another question which has been raised as a result of our stepped-up military support for Saigon.

Both former Ambassador Taylor and Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, believe that such action by Communist China is unlikely as long as that nation is not attacked. Many others agree.

For, no matter how belligerent the tone of the Chinese, they are fully aware of the fact that they would not enter a contest with the United States in southeast Asia on terms to their advantage. The Red Chinese know we are fully prepared militarily; that they would have to fight in an area exposed to effective U.S. airpower; and that there is a very real possibility that Soviet Russia would remain neutral in such a struggle.

Perhaps most significantly, neither the Chinese nor the North Vietnamese want to completely puncture the myth—already full of obvious holes—that the war in Vietnam is a civil war, a war, to use the Communist term, of national liberation.

Mr. President, there can be no easy way out of the situation in Vietnam. There are no cheap or quick solutions to a problem that has been with us for 11 years and that has occupied the energies of 3 Presidents.

But, I am confident that our policies which have been so carefully worked out and tested in the crucible of war have stood the test of time and, in the long run, will prove successful.

The American people, all people, want peace but not at the price of surrender to aggression. We have learned from hard and costly experience that peace without honor, peace without proper safeguards, peace "at any price," is merely the prelude to mounting aggression and bloody, costly war.

In his July 28 press conference, President Johnson said:

We are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American Nation. Three Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and your present President—over 11 years have committed themselves and have promised to help defend this small and valiant Nation.

Strengthened by that purpose, the people of South Vietnam have fought for many long years. Thousands of them have died. Thousands more have been crippled and scarred by war. We just cannot now dishonor our word, or abandon our commitment, or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow.

This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Vietnam.

I am convinced that we can do no less than the President has pledged we will do.

WHEAT SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA IN U.S. SHIPS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Executive order providing that 50 percent of all wheat shipped to Russia and Russian-bloc countries must be carried in U.S. bottoms represents a serious problem to the wheat industry of this Nation. No such provision applies to any other farm commodity or even industrial goods except for those that are declared strategic war materials.

From the days of the Pilgrims the U.S. wheat producers have had to depend on foreign markets for a large part of its production and currently far more than 50 percent. Even with greatly curtailed acreage through Government programs we still have a sizable surplus of wheat. This means that there is no other way for wheat farmers to survive without a farm price support program.

There would be little need of any price support program for wheat if we were not blocked out of the big dollar markets of the world as is now the case. The Fargo Forum of Fargo, N. Dak., under date of September 10, 1965, has a very appropriate editorial dealing with this subject which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks, and also a column by Richard Wilson appearing in the Wednesday, September 8, 1965, issue of the Evening Star entitled "Union Snaffles Wheat-Sale Hopes." Both of these in a very factual way set forth the problem all this presents, not only to the wheat industry, but to the entire Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Sept. 10, 1965]

MARITIME UNIONS PREVENT U.S. WHEAT FARMERS FROM SELLING ON WORLD MARKET

Once again the American maritime unions, notably leftwing in their thinking, and the ultraconservative wing of American political thought are working together to deprive the U.S. wheat farmer of a chance to sell his product on the world market.

They are adamant against letting American grain interests sell wheat to the East European nations, including Russia, unless 50 percent of the exports are shipped in American-flag vessels.

Cargo rates in American-flag vessels are higher than rates offered by foreign vessels, and this requirement has the effect of raising the cost of American wheat by at least 10 to 15 cents a bushel. So Russia and its allies buy wheat from Canada for gold. Canadian farmers are being urged to raise all the wheat they can, while the U.S. Congress debates a farm bill that is intended to continue controls over American wheat production in an effort to keep our surplus production from overflowing our storage bins.

Even if President Johnson or the Congress lifted the requirement for shipping half the wheat sold to Eastern Europe in American-flag vessels, there is considerable doubt that U.S. maritime workers would load the wheat.

Victor Rissel, a labor news reporter-columnist, recently interviewed Teddy Gleason, leader of 60,000 longshoremen. Gleason said it would take the U.S. Marines to get grain loaded onto any ship, American or foreign, in any U.S. port if U.S. shippers did not get half the business.

Rissel added: "And unless Gleason's followers load that grain, it won't get into the cargo holds. If the marines handle it, the American ships won't sail because their crews belong to Paul Hall's militant Seafarers, or the National Maritime Union. If the Government mans the ships, the marine engineers will strike again."

So labor won't let the American farmer enter the world wheat market without putting out its fist first and demanding a cut. And the same labor organizations—through their Congressman—are the first to complain about the high cost of farm subsidies which are intended only to give the farmer a fair return for his product.

The maritime blockade against the farmer makes a mockery of the Great Lakes seaway which gave the Great Plains farmer an outlet to the world markets.

[From the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, Sept. 8, 1965]

UNION SNAFFLES WHEAT-SALE HOPES (By Richard Wilson)

A labor union is successfully thwarting a major foreign policy thrust of the U.S. Government. This ludicrous situation illustrates to what lengths labor union tyranny can be carried.

But the fault lies not alone with the union; it also rests on an administration in Washington that will permit itself to be so intimidated.

The union involved is the militant leftwing Maritime Union, backed up by George Meany, president of AFL-CIO. The issue is sales of American surplus wheat to the Soviet Union. But far more is involved than merely unloading American farm surpluses.

Communism's great failure is its inability everywhere, in China and Cuba as well as the Soviet Union, to organize agricultural production to feed properly an industrialized society. It is a glaring failure of State socialism known to all the important people of the world and thus is a continuous question mark behind the effectiveness of the Communist system. Moreover the problem of agricultural production is the chief prob-

lem of every emerging nation of the world, from Vietnam to Tanzania.

The Soviet Union is undergoing the humiliating experience of scrambling in the world market for wheat to feed the industrial sector of her society because her farm technology is hopelessly fouled up under Socialist direction and cannot stand the slightest adversity in crop-growing weather.

Imagine the great planners of the abundant society in Moscow, that society that would leave the United States far behind in material progress, having to go hat-in-hand to Ottawa and Canberra seeking enough wheat to avoid bread riots in Sverdlovsk.

But the Moscow bargainers will accept only so much humiliation, and they balk at buying American wheat that they can't bring into their own ports in shipping of their own choosing. This is the point at which the Maritime Union has thwarted a U.S. policy of getting rid of American surplus wheat while at the same time focusing a glaring light on the failure of Socialist planning.

The union forced President Kennedy to impose the requirement that 50 percent of any wheat sold to the Russians must be transported in American vessels so as to provide employment for American seamen, the highest paid in the world.

Since American shipping costs are about 40-percent higher than those of other countries, the requirement has a very discouraging effect on Russian purchases. Russians get their wheat elsewhere when they can, from Canada, Argentina, Australia, and France.

In practice, all that the 50-percent requirement has done is discourage any shipments of American wheat to the Soviet Union, and that reduces maritime employment rather than increases it. The opportunity to get rid of many millions of bushels of American wheat is lost, but the Soviet Union is little the worse for it.

Behind the scenes, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has been urging President Johnson to lift the 50-percent requirement. HUMPHREY is reflecting the desires of the grain trade and grain farmers in his home State of Minnesota. It is ironic that congressional and public support has swung in favor of the practicalities of trading with the Russians, but that the rightwing political organizations and the leftwing Maritime Union join in blocking it.

Meany's opposition is notable only for its adamancy. He seems wholly under the influence of his adviser, Jay Lovestone, a recanted U.S. Communist Party official, who has reacted so strongly against his former associations that he wants no truck with the Communist world at all.

Johnson has hung back, apparently fearing that if he lifts the 50-percent requirement dock workers will refuse to load the ships, as they did in 1964. To enforce his policy he might have to call out Federal troops. That would be a politically exploitable contradiction: Paratroopers loading wheat for the Russians while the Air Force bombs Russian-manned missile sites in Vietnam.

Informed officials here are forecasting that in 6 months or so the conditions may have been created for breaking the Maritime Union tyranny. Why not now?

DEATH OF DR. MORTIMER TAUBE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the most beloved citizens of Montgomery County, Md., passed away last week.

Dr. Mortimer Taube was an outstanding civic leader, a remarkable businessman and an extraordinarily learned and sensitive human being.

Long active in civic affairs, Dr. Taube served during the past 2 years as chairman of the United Givers Fund for Montgomery County.

A specialist in the field of information theory, Dr. Taube had organized Documentation, Inc., in 1951 with three employees. The firm now employs more than 700 persons and is the world's largest aerospace information center, running the scientific and technical information service for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Although his firm worked chiefly with computer-stored information, Dr. Taube vigorously opposed the overcomputerization of modern life. His book, "Computers and Commonsense," published in 1961, emphasized his admonition that computers cannot think.

A philosopher by training, Dr. Taube studied at Harvard during the 1930's under Alfred North Whitehead. He received a doctorate in philosophy in 1935 from the University of California.

Last year, he served as an adjunct professor at the Columbia University School of Library Science, flying to New York once a week to teach a course on modern methods of information gathering.

At the time of his death, he was working on a book to be called "Philosophy for Philistines."

Dr. Taube's death, at age 55, came as a deep shock to me and to all who knew and loved him.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Montgomery County Sentinel of September 9 be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montgomery County Sentinel, Sept. 9, 1965]

DR. MORTIMER TAUBE

Dr. Mortimer Taube is dead and his passing is a grievous loss to the Montgomery County community.

A man of many interests—he was a philosopher, astute businessman, sportsman, scientist, author, teacher, music lover, art collector—he had a fine mind and boundless energy and enthusiasm. Like many men of notable achievement, he needed—or wanted—little sleep. Like Robert Frost he felt he had many miles to travel before he slept. And promises to keep. His premature death at the age of only 55 is tragic indeed.

Typical of men of his caliber he was genuinely concerned about his community. And typical of the man he didn't scatter his shots. The single institution that performs best for the community's less fortunate is United Givers Fund, raising huge sums of money for social welfare agencies that relieve enormous distress and soften tragedy. Dr. Taube served as chairman of last year's UGF drive in the county and when he died he had accepted the chairmanship of this year's drive and was, despite the heavy demands on his time, already throwing himself into this most worthwhile community endeavor.

Four days before his death he sent a letter to all leading business firms in Montgomery County announcing a meeting in his office at which he wanted to discuss "how best we can jointly assume the responsibility which faces us."

We can think of no more fitting tribute to his memory than for the community to give to this year's UGF fund drive in his name. He would be pleased.

There are too few Dr. Mortimer Taubes in the world and their departure creates a great void. The sympathies of the entire Montgomery County community go out to his family. It is our loss, too.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTED SUBSTANTIALLY ON VIETNAM POLICIES AND TACTICS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is gratifying to read newspaper accounts of Louis Harris polls, as published Sunday and today in the Washington Post, under the encouraging headlines, "Support Solidifying for Johnson Course in Vietnam Crisis," and "Administration Backed on Tactics in Vietnam."

I commend the President of the United States and continue to support his Vietnam policies. As I stated in a speech at Ramage, W. Va., at a large family reunion event on August 22, 1965, an action such as that in which America is involved in Vietnam is not acclaimed in the ordinary sense of popularity. Who would expect such circumstances to be popular? But the consensus of support for efforts there is overwhelming. Widespread knowledge exists in our country that it is necessary for the United States and other anti-Communist nations to draw the line there against Communistic aggression, expansion, and infiltration. We must blunt the Communist drive in Vietnam and convince the Reds that they should negotiate a peaceful settlement.

In comments on our involvement in Vietnam, I also declared, and I reemphasize today, that we are not going it alone in Vietnam, as some citizens would have other citizens believe. And we are not prosecuting an aggrandizing offensive against a small country. We are in a complex effort—even more so than in Korea. But that root fact is that we are assisting South Vietnam, with more than three dozen other allied countries, in an effort to contain communism in southeast Asia and thereby stabilize the tenuous peace.

Although we are in a form of war on a small front in a faraway land on a limited basis, we continue as a Nation to experience a relatively peaceful life instead of the disaster of a major holocaust and instead of rapid Communistic expansion.

The satisfaction which comes from peace, even in the relative sense, and from prosperity at home in the factual sense, will not be ours for long, however, unless we continue with vigor to prosecute our efforts in Vietnam.

I repeat: we do have allies there—more than 36 of them—in addition to the Republic of South Vietnam. Their numbers and contributions to the fight against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Communists will grow until the Reds are convinced they cannot conquer or take over in that distant but vital area. They must be convinced that peace is the only real solution.

For us to abandon the effort and pull out, as some citizens counsel, would be an invitation to the communistic hordes to swarm over all of southeast Asia—and then over all of Asia—and to break loose aggressively and insidiously in many other parts of the world. Where can we

draw the line against the Communists better than in Vietnam?

We must and we will hold on the Vietnamese line. Otherwise, we will be facing peril and possibly will be forced to fight a larger war on a much closer front. In strength we will find peace. If we weaken, the future of our country will be insecure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD articles from the Washington Post of Sunday, September 12, 1965, "The Harris Survey—Support Solidifying for Johnson Course in Vietnam Crisis," and Monday, September 13, 1965, "The Harris Survey—Administration Backed on Tactics in Vietnam," and I ask unanimous consent, also, to have printed in the RECORD the text of an address I delivered in Parkersburg, W. Va., August 7, 1965, on the subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1965]

THE HARRIS SURVEY—SUPPORT SOLIDIFYING FOR JOHNSON COURSE IN VIETNAM CRISIS

(By Louis Harris)

President Johnson today has more solid support for his policies in Vietnam—68 percent of the public—than at any other time since the fighting began to escalate in February. Opposition to U.S. involvement in the war appears to be fading, while public opinion behind a firm military posture is very substantial.

The American people apparently have passed an important threshold in their thinking about Vietnam. Only a relatively small minority any longer expect a quick settlement of the war. More than twice as many, in fact a majority of the public, believe that the Vietnam fighting will go on for several years.

It is now clear that as concern over the war in Asia has mounted—73 percent say they think about it often and 61 percent feel personally affected by it—most Americans have concluded that the failure of the United States to stand firm in Vietnam would lead to even deeper trouble for the free world later on.

On five occasions this year, the Harris Survey has asked cross sections of the public:

"How would you rate the job President Johnson has been doing in handling the war in Vietnam—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

L.B.J. handling of war
[in percent]

| | Excellent— pretty good | Only fair— poor |
|----------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| September..... | 66 | 34 |
| July..... | 65 | 35 |
| May..... | 57 | 43 |
| March..... | 60 | 40 |
| January..... | 41 | 59 |

From the essentially negative feelings of last January, public opinion has shifted sharply. Furthermore, there is a growing firmness about the course the American people want to see followed in Vietnam. The public was asked in May, July, and again in this latest survey:

"What course do you feel the United States should follow in the Vietnam fighting—carry the ground fighting to North Vietnam, at the risk of bringing Red China into the war, negotiate a settlement, or hold the line to keep the Communists from taking over South Vietnam?"

[In percent]

| | Sept. | July | May |
|--------------------------|-------|------|-----|
| Hold the line..... | 49 | 45 | 42 |
| Negotiate..... | 25 | 30 | 36 |
| Carry the war north..... | 26 | 25 | 22 |

In order to test just how solidly people are willing to hold to their positions about the Vietnam war, a series of statements was presented to people who professed to hold each point of view. After each statement was read, each person was then asked if he would still agree with his stated position. The results are particularly revealing.

All of the 25 percent of the public who want to carry the war to North Vietnam are willing to see this done even if it means the Government would have to reimpose the taxes that were reduced last year. Ninety-five percent of this group feel the war should be carried to the North even if it means that the United States would become involved in an Asian land war with casualties as great as in Korea or if it means that Russia and China join forces with North Vietnam. Ninety-two percent of this group favor carrying the war to the North even if it means we would ultimately have to use atom bombs on the Chinese mainland.

The bulk of Americans—the 49 percent who want to hold the line in South Vietnam—feel almost as strongly about that view. Ninety-five percent of them say they are willing to give up last year's tax cut to maintain that position. Seventy-three percent say they are for holding the line even if it means a land war as in Korea. Sixty-nine percent say they are for holding the line even if it means Russia and China join with North Vietnam. And 58 percent are for staying in South Vietnam even if it means the eventual use of atom bombs against China.

In sharp contrast, the 25 percent of the public who want to end the fighting in Vietnam with the best settlement we can get is far less solid in its views. Seventy percent of these people say they would change their minds about our course in Vietnam if it means that Communists would use similar tactics on other continents. Almost two-thirds say they would change their minds if negotiating our way out of Vietnam means that the Communists would take over all of southeast Asia or that Americans would be fighting against Communist wars of liberation in other places in the next 15 years.

Thus, it is clear that some of the possible consequences of pulling out of Vietnam now are unacceptable even to those who believe President Johnson is pursuing the wrong policy there.

In fact, when public opinion about Vietnam is assessed in the light of these probes, it is perfectly apparent that the American people are nearly 70-80 behind the proposition that Vietnam should be the ground on which the United States should take its stand against communism in Asia.

There is little doubt now that most Americans appear ready for a long haul in Vietnam, as distasteful as the sacrifice and suffering might be. This was evident in the replies to another question:

"Do you feel the war in Vietnam will now last several years, or do you feel it is likely to be settled soon?"

| | Percent |
|--------------------|---------|
| Several years..... | 54 |
| Settled soon..... | 24 |
| Not sure..... | 22 |

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 13, 1965]

THE HARRIS SURVEY—ADMINISTRATION BACKED ON TACTICS IN VIETNAM

(By Louis Harris)

As reported yesterday, the American public is now solidly behind the present U.S. policy to do everything possible to prevent a Communist takeover in South Vietnam. On most questions of specific military and political tactics in the war there, people in this country also tend to back the decisions made in Washington.

There are, however, two important exceptions. By a 3-to-2 margin, the public would like to see the United Nations take over the defense of South Vietnam as it did in Korea in the early 1950's. And by a 5-to-4 margin, the public favors imposing a naval and air blockade on the ports of North Vietnam.

The Johnson administration has not used a blockade, and the United Nations is not involved in the defense of South Vietnam.

On other important tactical points, however, key decisions made by Washington receive strong support. For example 2 out of every 3 Americans who have an opinion on the issue oppose bombing Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam, despite some demands in this country that such attacks be carried out. By 5 to 1, the public also supports the refusal of the administration to use tactical atomic ground weapons or to bomb the mainland of China. And the \$1 billion economic assistance program Mr. Johnson pledged for all of southeast Asia if the war in Vietnam were to end meets with better than 2-to-1 public acceptance among a cross section of the adult public.

KEY VIETNAM POLICIES

"I want to read off to you a number of positions the Johnson administration has taken on Vietnam. For each, I wish you would tell me if you think the administration is more right or more wrong."

[In percent]

| | More right | More wrong | Not sure |
|--|------------|------------|----------|
| Not using tactical atomic ground weapons..... | 67 | 14 | 19 |
| Not bombing the China mainland..... | 66 | 13 | 22 |
| Pledging \$1,000,000,000 to southeast Asia if war ends..... | 48 | 22 | 30 |
| Not bombing Hanoi..... | 47 | 20 | 33 |
| Not blockading North Vietnam ports..... | 31 | 38 | 31 |
| Not asking United Nations to take over defense of South Vietnam..... | 29 | 42 | 29 |

It is significant that even people who say they want to escalate the ground war by carrying it to North Vietnam oppose the use of tactical atomic weapons and the extension of air strikes to China. This group would likewise favor the United Nations' taking over the military direction of the war in Vietnam.

On the question of bombing Hanoi or imposing a blockade on North Vietnamese ports, there are sharp divisions according to people's general views on overall strategy.

Bombing Hanoi

[In percent]

| | Favor bombing | Oppose bombing | Not sure |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------|
| Nationwide..... | 20 | 47 | 33 |
| By attitude toward war: | | | |
| Carry to North Vietnam on ground..... | 48 | 28 | 24 |
| Hold line..... | 14 | 62 | 24 |
| Negotiate best we can..... | 13 | 52 | 35 |

Blockading North Vietnam ports

[In percent]

| | Favor bombing | Oppose bombing | Not sure |
|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------|
| Nationwide..... | 38 | 31 | 31 |
| By attitude toward war: | | | |
| Carry to North Vietnam..... | 64 | 18 | 18 |
| Hold line..... | 39 | 38 | 23 |
| Negotiate best we can..... | 25 | 40 | 35 |
| By 1964 vote: | | | |
| Goldwater voters..... | 45 | 23 | 32 |
| Johnson voters..... | 36 | 35 | 29 |
| By sex: | | | |
| Men..... | 46 | 31 | 23 |
| Women..... | 30 | 31 | 39 |

In the case of both issues, the balance of power is clearly held by the group who would like to hold the line in South Vietnam. The hold-the-liners are overwhelmingly opposed to bombing Hanoi but tend by a narrow margin to favor a blockade.

It is interesting to note that the people who voted for Barry Goldwater in 1964 are heavily in favor of the blockade, while Johnson voters are split down the middle. This, of course, bears out a division that emerged in the 1964 election itself.

When asked 'if they feel Mr. Johnson's position on Vietnam now is more like Goldwater's than it was a year ago, or is it still very different, Goldwater backers by nearly 2 to 1 think the President has come over to the former Republican Senator's views. But those who voted for President Johnson last year feel just as decisively that this is not the case.

CURBING COMMUNISTIC EXPANSION AND AGGRESSION

(Speech by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, at Parkersburg, W. Va., August 7, 1965)

Today, as never before, the American proposition of the dignity of freemen is threatened by an implacable, ruthless and resourceful enemy. In 48 years, international communism has grown from a handful of theorists and revolutionaries to a power which now rigidly controls one-third of mankind and has penetrated in varying degrees the remaining two-thirds.

In southeast Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa, and in Latin America, communism has made significant inroads in the past 20 years—and not by military means alone, but by exploiting the tensions of the newly independent societies and by holding forth a false but appealing vision of a new life.

This is a time for our rededication to the ideals for which the American struggle for independence was fought, and for dedication to the right of all men and women to share in those ideals.

Though we are locked in a struggle for which we can see no early end, we must not allow ourselves to be stampeded by alarmist cries of impending doom. Rather, let us continue in patience and intelligent determination to seek the grounds for a just and enduring peace and the maintenance of individual liberty.

I believe it is time to ask a truly pertinent question, and it is this—What kind of a world would we now have if, in the last 20 years, the several Communist aggressions, wars of liberation, and involvement in the affairs of others had not been met?

This a fair inquiry at a time when the Communists are berating this country as imperialistic and when a number of our fellow countrymen—not excepting segments of the press—seem to feel uneasy because

the United States has acted forthrightly in a time of international crisis.

In answering the question each individual must consider the Soviet record particularly and the Communist record in general.

In the years since the end of World War II it has been necessary for the United States and the free world to meet and counter subversions and aggressions in Iran, Greece, Turkey, Berlin, the Philippines, Korea, Lebanon, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and now in southeast Asia.

It will be recalled that scarcely had Japan surrendered before the Soviets, by infiltration and assistance to a local Communist group, had set up an independent government in a province of Iran. The United States strongly protested and placed the issue before the newly created United Nations. Our country's position was clear. If the United Nations had been defied there likely would have been direct United States action, I believe. All signs pointed in that direction, but the Russians deliberated and then reluctantly withdrew from that Communist excursion into the Iranian province. Had the Red aggression not been met, the Soviets soon would have taken over all of Iran, and it seems to be a proper assumption that within a year thereafter all of the rich Middle East would have been occupied or controlled by the Communists.

It is pertinent to cite that Winston Churchill, in 1947, said that only U.S. possession of the atomic bomb had stood between the Soviets and a takeover of Europe.

Collaterally, there were developed the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan.

The Truman Doctrine was enforced to save Greece and Turkey, even though in Greece the Communists' forces reached the suburbs of Athens. Turkey, in political chaos and near bankruptcy, was on the verge of capture by the Communists when the United States intervened. United States and free world actions in Greece and Turkey immediately following World War II were direct and decisive.

Application of the Marshall plan in another action of the post-World War II period saved Italy and France from chaos and communism.

Later came the Berlin blockade by the Soviets. This was an attempt to drive the United States and our allies out of Berlin. But the successfully accomplished airlift by the United States thwarted that Communist scheme.

We recall that for a number of months that city of several million persons was supplied with food, coal, and clothing only because of the airlifting of those necessities on an around-the-clock basis. It was a determined, but hazardous mission on the part of our country; it succeeded without provoking hostilities and was a stabilizer of the tenuous peace experienced in the midst of the cold war.

Then, too, at the close of World War II there was a large Communist force (the Huks) in the Philippines receiving Soviet assistance. The Huks attempted to overthrow the established government through guerrilla action. The same pattern was attempted by the Communists in Malaya. And, of course, we are aware that a Soviet and Red Chinese supported North Korean army, violating agreements, made a surprise strike into South Korea in the spring of 1950. In the early weeks of that Communist aggression, the invaders from Red-held territory nearly succeeded in their takeover mission. We recall that this communistic effort brought the United Nations into action on land, sea, and in the air—with the United States supplying the major forces, but with allies assisting. Total casualties on the U.N. side of that major and catastrophic armed confrontation with the Communists reached 160,000 before the Red excursion was halted.

It was in the first administration of President Eisenhower that the Korean affair was arrested, but it was also during the Eisenhower years that this country became involved in southeast Asia, including Laos and Vietnam. After 1954 the Russians and Red Chinese assisted in equipping and training the Vietcong Communist forces in Vietnam. Now, 12 years later, they continue to do so, and a treaty agreement was violated by North Vietnam and Russia in supporting this guerrilla force of the Vietcong.

To point out the wide dispersion of the Communist expansion activity, we recall also that in the Eisenhower years it was necessary to land troops from our U.S. forces in Lebanon to prevent a Communist coup in that country against a legitimately established government.

It is fresh in our memories, of course, that the late President Kennedy's firm policies prevented the Soviets from arming Cuba to the hilt with missiles within close range of our country.

Quick action by President Johnson earlier this year significantly prevented what could have been further take-over efforts in this hemisphere by the Communists in the Dominican Republic.

Had not the cited aggressions been met resolutely by all four of our Presidents since World War II, the position of the United States and the whole Western World long ago would have become so unstable as to have brought freedom to the brink of doom and communism to the fore as the dominant world force.

From the initial event in Iran to the present in southeast Asia, the Soviet record in the past score of years is one of gross interference in the affairs of other countries. The bellicose Red Chinese have been participating similarly and even more insidiously in recent years.

Notwithstanding these citations from modern history, we hear the United States arrogantly accused from Moscow, Peiping, Havana and Hanoi of having imperialistic designs and of interference in the affairs of other peoples.

It is an even more saddening experience to read in segments of the press and to hear some of our own citizens—seemingly without any reference whatever to the Communists' record of the past 2 decades—in expressions of contempt and in utterances of confusion concerning the policies of this country and its leaders in time of crisis.

I believe it remains clear that the aim of this Government continues to be the protecting of freedom and independence from Communist aggression without resort to general war.

Following President Johnson's press conference and address to the Nation on the Vietnam crisis recently, the Washington Post commented editorially:

"We do not see how President Johnson could have explained the necessity of the United States course in Vietnam more effectively than he did when he said:

"If we are driven from the fields in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in our promise of protection. In each land the forces of independence would be weakened. An Asia so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself * * *

"We just cannot now dishonor our word or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow. This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in the Vietnam."

"The President's reference to 'Asian communism' doubtless holds special significance. His exclusion of the Russians from his comments was an indirect appeal for Moscow's understanding of why we must do what we

are doing. The Soviet Union shares at least some of the alarm in the West over the openly belligerent and recklessly aggressive course of Communist China and the North Vietnam Hanoi Government. President Johnson seemed to be saying to Moscow that the United States is doing everything possible to avoid a general war and that the two major nuclear powers have a common interest in not allowing this Asian Communist brushfire to get out of hand for want of a rational confrontation at a conference table.

"Within the United States, we surmise that the response to the President's speech will be overwhelmingly favorable. Despite the innate hatred of war, most of the people are aware of the kind of world we live in. They appear to be reconciled to a hard struggle in a far away land because of the close relation it has to the preservation of our own freedom * * *"

I agree completely with Max Freedman, whose views I summarize from a recent discussion of "America's Stake in Vietnam":

"What is at stake in Vietnam is not alone the noble but elusive concept of national honor but the stark imperatives of self-interest of the United States to have its word respected by every friend and feared by every foe. Without this respect the United States would be a hollow giant. With it, and without self-righteousness, it can be a guardian of peace. For its pledges can never be recklessly given, but once given, they must be resolutely redeemed. Otherwise national honor would indeed be seriously compromised—and national safety too."

There are those in this country who argue that what is happening in Vietnam is a civil war in which the United States has neither the right nor the interest to intervene. Whatever else may be said of this argument, it surely cannot be denied that it has not prevailed with three Presidents or with successive sessions of Congress.

The national commitment has rested on the principle that Communist aggression and Communist subversion are in fact taking place in Vietnam. It rests on that principle today.

What would happen if the United States abandoned that principle and retreated from its obligations? The results would not be limited to the loss of South Vietnam's freedom and the cruel punishments exacted by Communist tyranny. The calamitous results would be seen in a diminished respect for the stability of America's commitments and therefore in an increased threat to peace.

For the lesson of Vietnam, in these tragic circumstances of evasion and betrayal and retreat, would not be that aggression and subversion never succeed. The grim and dangerous lesson would be that the United States always runs away when the going gets rough and abandons its friends in the time of challenge. How could that lesson help the hopes of peace?

Does it not appeal to commonsense to suggest that weakness and retreat by the United States in Vietnam would bring new threats to peace in other vulnerable areas?

Rightly or wrongly, the United States for many years has made a test case out of Vietnam and now it must be tested by it. National self-interest gives no other choice except at the cost of intolerable risks.

This does not mean that the United States is committed to an endless war in Asia. It does not mean that the United States wants to enlarge the war, to provoke China, or to widen the breach with Russia.

The President's desire to seek peace even while refusing to yield to Communist pressure must be manifest now to everyone who has any respect for facts. He has rejected the extreme policies of some of his advisers in the hope that the Communists would come to the conference table before the field

of battle takes its frightful toll. But he will do whatever is necessary to redeem America's pledge if Communist pressure continues its ugly grip on South Vietnam.

The argument there has been in the cold and inevitable terms of self-interest, not in the emotional terms of freedom.

A ROUSING ROUNDUP

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the most dramatic beatings of an old sword into a new plowshare has recently been completed in my State and the experience has enriched everyone connected with the event. I refer to the 1965 Senior Girl Scout Roundup held on the site of a one-time Navy training base at Farragut, Idaho.

When it was learned that Idaho would play host to this outstanding gathering, huge bulldozers rolled into the former military installation which had been in long disuse on the shore of one of America's most beautiful mountain lakes. The machines smashed flat the last vestiges of the barracks and other machines, graded, and landscaped the area. Then there rose phoenix-like out of the debris of the old Navy base, a new tent city which eventually housed 10,000 girls and their counselors. Here the Girl Scouts came with their, "On the Trail to Tomorrow."

It was the free world's largest assembly of teenage girls: 9,000 Senior Girl Scouts, 2,000 leaders and administrative personnel, from all 50 States and though all-American in its spirit, universal enough to attract delegations of Girl Scouts from 40 foreign countries.

On the Trail to Tomorrow these girls were welcomed by Idaho's four ages; the age of thousands, even millions, of years ago, in natural wonders which remain just as our ancestors saw them for the first time; the age of yesterday's Wild West, for Idaho is still only a little more than a human lifespan away from the Oregon Trail, the colorful gold rushes, and the thundering herds; the age of today where the best of modern progress and comfort lives in strange closeness with the past; and the age of tomorrow, for Idaho with its atomic installations is already a vital part of nuclear advancement and space exploration.

We feel that Idaho provided a perfect setting for the Girl Scout Roundup. And there was a wonderful spirit of get-together about the entire event. Our Idaho Basque dancers performed. As the warmth of Idaho hospitality spread, the outreach of Girl Scout ideals was felt throughout Idaho, too.

I am sure that our Girl Scout visitors are taking home a new and more active interest in everything American. As these girls depart upon the Trail to Tomorrow, they have left us a memorable gift. Idaho is now not only more on the map than ever. Idaho now has a warmer place in the heart of every State in our Union.

To the largest group of visitors we ever entertained at one time we say, "Come back again, soon."

NIKOLA PETKOV, BULGARIAN NATIONAL HERO AND GREATEST MARTYR IN THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Nikola Dimitrov Petkov was born in Sofia in 1894. He was the son of Dimitar Petkov, a self-educated peasant from Dobrudja, who became Prime Minister of Bulgaria. Dimitar Petkov was assassinated in 1907 for opposing foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Bulgaria, especially on the part of tsarist Russia.

Petko Petkov, Nikola's brother, was one of the greatest Bulgarian peasant leaders. He fought Alexander Tzankov's fascist dictatorship of 1923 and as a result was shot down on a Sofia street on June 14, 1924—exactly 1 year after the merciless assassination of Alexander Stamboliiski.

Nikola Petkov received a law degree in Paris, where he spent most of his youth. During the Nazi occupation of Bulgaria he was an underground leader and was imprisoned several times.

When the Nazis were driven out of Bulgaria, Nikola Petkov and three other representatives of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union—the largest political organization in Bulgaria—took part in the first coalition government, together with Communists, Socialists, representatives of the political group "Zveno," and the independent intellectuals. Together with Dr. G. M. Dimitrov, Secretary General of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union, Nikola Petkov fought stubbornly against Communist outrages, terror, and violence, and thus incurred the hatred of both the Communist Party and the Soviet occupation authorities. Despite these difficulties, he continued to defend the freedom and independence of his country.

When the Soviet occupation authorities demanded the removal of the "capitalist agent" Dr. G. M. Dimitrov from his post as Secretary General, Nikola Petkov took his place.

In July 1945, Nikola Petkov sent a memorandum to the Inter-Allied Control Commission demanding the postponement of the elections which the Communists had scheduled for the end of August 1945. These elections were to involve only one list of candidates, headed by the Communist Party. As a result of the memorandum, the Prime Minister declared that Petkov had resigned, although formally he never did so. In protest, Nikola Petkov and other cabinet ministers broke up the coalition government, and thenceforth openly opposed the Communist dictatorship. Upon intervention of the Control Commission, the elections were postponed until November 18th, 1945.

During the winter of 1946, Stalin sent Vishinsky to Sofia for the purpose of getting Petkov to come back into the government. At their dramatic meeting, Petkov declared that it was not his custom to obey the orders of any foreigner, but to listen only to the will of the Bulgarian people.

That meeting decided Petkov's fate.

In October 1946, Petkov headed the opposition in its election campaign against the Communist-Soviet attempts to seize full control of the country. The enthusiastic people from the countryside and towns voted en masse for Petkov's list, but the election results were falsified and violence and bloodshed were commonplace. Nevertheless, 101 people's representatives headed by Petkov, were acknowledged to have been elected and triumphantly entered the Grand National Assembly. It was there that Petkov's most courageous and heroic struggle culminated. Availing himself of his constitutional immunity, he unmasked in Parliament the treacherous intentions of the Communist and their leader, Georgi Dimitrov, former Secretary-General of the Comintern. He accused them of being Stalinist agents, and said that their hands were stained with the blood of innocent Bulgarians and that they wanted to make Bulgaria a Soviet province.

As a result of his activity, Petkov was charged with conspiracy against the state and the Soviet Union. Like his predecessor, he was called an agent of Anglo-American capitalism.

After dramatic and stormy debates in Parliament, Petkov was arrested inside the Parliament building in complete defiance of the Constitution and the law. Petkov declared dauntlessly that he would share with pride the fate of his father and his brother.

On August 16 Petkov was sentenced to die on the gallows.

Early in the morning of September 23, only 15 minutes after midnight, he was executed in secret because the Communists feared the people's mass indignation. At that time all executions took place about 5 o'clock in the morning.

Prior to the execution a representative of the Bulgarian Communist government appeared in Nikola Petkov's prison cell and offered him a pardon if he signed a petition in which he declared his repentance.

Petkov replied.

You are even trying to desecrate my sacred memory, my sentence was passed by your Moscow masters and no one can revoke it. I do not seek any mercy from you. I want to die so that my people may be freed sooner.

The heroic example set by Nikola Petkov shook the free world and opened its eyes to the treacherous intentions and methods of the Bolshevik international conspiracy and the tragic fate which Soviet imperialism is preparing for all of humanity.

Petkov's career was a brilliant model of self-sacrifices for his people, principles, ideas, freedom and democracy. Thousands and thousands of Bulgarian patriots followed his great example.

That is the reason why the American Congressmen who, upon the occasion of a visit to Bulgaria, laid a wreath on his freshly dug grave, called him one of the greatest democrats of all time.

This is why government officials and statesmen from all over the world sent protest notes to his Sofia and Moscow

September 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5137

CALIFORNIA

Oppose the request of the city of Oakland to the U.S. Corps of Engineers to fill in 130 acres of San Francisco Bay.

Endorse Assemblyman Z'berg's bills to curtail near absolute authority of State department of highways.

Oppose freeway construction in National Tribute Redwood Grove near Crescent City. The Garden Club of America provided funds for establishment of this grove.

Oppose H.R. 8443, which provides amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which would permit erection of head wires and high tower near Woodside.

Oppose building of Topatopa Dam and public highway in the Sespe Creek project, thereby destroying the last nesting grounds of the condor.

CONNECTICUT

Oppose highway in East Rock Park, New Haven.

Oppose contamination of the Connecticut River by the Connecticut Yankee Atomic Powerplant near Haddam.

ILLINOIS

Oppose invasion of Morton Arboretum by four-lane highway—protest successful.

Oppose intrusion of Wheeler National Wildlife Refuge by Interstate 65.

MAINE

Oppose State highway department plan to cut through the Scarborough Marshes, recently acquired by the State game and fish commission.

MASSACHUSETTS

Oppose development of Mount Graylock by tramway authority group.

Oppose opening national wildlife refuge to public hunting.

MINNESOTA

Oppose the Northern States powerplant in order to keep the St. Croix River for recreation.

Oppose logging and vehicular intrusion by the Bureau of Forests in the Boundary Waters Canoe area. Protest successful.

MISSISSIPPI

Oppose housing development on Eye Horn Island.

MONTANA

Oppose Bureau of Reclamation's plan to build two water storage dams in the Bob Marshall Wilderness area.

NEW YORK

Oppose building of Con Edison pump storage hydroelectric plant, and resulting damage to Harvard Black Rock Park, Storm King Mountain, Hudson River. Approved by the FPC.

Oppose location for proposed Oyster Bay-Rye Bridge over Long Island Sound.

Oppose irreparable damage in two natural area sanctuaries (given by two Garden Club of America members) and loss of 2,000 acres of potential park land if Interstate 87 is located in the Chestnut Ridge area, Westchester County.

Fire Island, Long Island. Threat of a four-lane highway resulted in such protest that the Fire Island National Sea Shore was established.

Oppose destruction of Great South Bay, Long Islands, marshlands, by filling in, pollution, and dredging practices.

Oppose reconstruction plans for Route No. 17, which would result in the ruination of the Beaverkill and Willowmere River.

OHIO

Worked for Swamp Creek Park proposal, Toledo, which resulted in saving 410 acres for Toledo Metropolitan Park Board.

Oppose invasion of Emerald Belt, Cleveland, by highway.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Oppose the damming of the Santee River Basin.

TENNESSEE

Oppose locating Interstate 40 through 35 acres of Overton Park, Memphis.

Oppose the building of the Tellico Dam.

VIRGINIA

Oppose building of Salem Dam, Fauquier County, which would flood 36 miles of the Rappahannock River, eliminating a wildlife sanctuary.

Fauquier County—Beverly Mill, historic landmark threatened by proposed highway construction; saved by Secretary Udall's intervention.

Oppose section in the Assateague Island bill, which would permit the building of a highway in the national seashore, causing damage to the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

The Doors Are Open to a Settlement in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 2, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster once said, "God grants liberty only to those who love it, who are always ready to guard and defend it." This is what we are doing in Vietnam; we are guarding and defending liberty.

President Johnson has opened all doors leading to a negotiated peace in Vietnam and only Hanoi is holding it up. All of us hope that the day will soon come when Ho Chi Minh will agree to meet at the conference table.

The following column by the distinguished journalist, Roscoe Drummond, describes how willing and able we are to meet at the conference table in an effort to resolve the issues in Vietnam.

The article follows:

THE DOORS ARE OPEN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—With the help of Senator Mike Mansfield—an Asian expert in his own right—President Johnson has now opened all doors to a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Speaking for the White House as well as for himself, Senator Mansfield made it clear that all roads lead to the conference table and that by taking any one of them Hanoi can have peace instead of war.

There are three such roads to negotiation and all are acceptable to the United States:

1. We will go to the conference with or without a cease-fire, with or without a truce. We'll negotiate under either circumstance. Hanoi can choose. We prefer a cease-fire, but don't insist upon it.

2. We will go to the conference table without any advance commitment as to what either side would accept as a settlement. We would not be committed to the conditions which Hanoi might want. Hanoi would not be committed in any way to the conditions we would want. Namely, unconditional discussions.

3. We are also willing to go to the conference table after a careful review of positions on both sides to see whether a basis for agreement is conceivable before formal discussions begin. Namely, conditional discussions, if Hanoi prefers it that way.

No door is closed. All avenues are open. It was at this third door on which the Democratic Senate leader rapped the hardest.

Mr. Mansfield compared the objectives outlined by President Johnson in various speeches and the objectives set out by Hanoi on April 12. He found that on three out of four stated objectives both sides were in substantial agreement:

On the right of the people of South Vietnam to have a government of their own choosing without violence or coercion from any quarter.

On the right of the people of North and South Vietnam, on the basis of a peaceful, free, and verified plebiscite, to decide whether to unite or not to unite the two halves of the country.

On the desirability of having all foreign bases and troops removed from both South and North Vietnam after peace is restored.

Either side might phrase these conditions of peace in different terms, but basically each is saying the same thing. This is why Senator Mansfield says he sees a "narrowing of the issues" and hopes that his effort to narrow the dispute will show Hanoi that there is a basis for early negotiation.

A wide difference does exist on one objective. Hanoi wants the Communist Vietcong to have a decisive or major role in any government in South Vietnam and the Government of South Vietnam doesn't want any part of the Vietcong. That's what the war is all about. We're prepared to leave this issue to the verified decision of the people of South Vietnam—if Hanoi is.

The Mansfield speech did two other things: For the United States it closed off the most serious chink in the unity of the Democratic Party in support of the President's military actions in Vietnam. Mr. Mansfield has been a partial critic and, more recently, a reluctant advocate of the President's course. His latest speech shows that Hanoi might as well give up its hope that disunity within the United States will force the Government to stop defending South Vietnam.

For Hanoi, the Mansfield speech might add credibility to Mr. Johnson's repeated willingness to negotiate. The Communists have been saying that the President's talk of peace was only a coverup for his desire for war. Not true. And Mansfield, speaking as one who opposed the air raids to the north, makes the peace overtures even more meaningful.

Monroe County Memorial to Mrs. George R. Navarre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 9, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Monroe, located in the Second Congressional District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent in the House of Representatives, recently held groundbreaking ceremonies for the Lillian Stewart Navarre Library in Monroe. The ceremonies, attended by Mayor William J. Agusta, City Director Leonard E. Leis, Monroe County NAACP Chapter President Charles Campbell, Jr., and County Librarian Mrs. Karl Daume, and others, celebrated the beginning of the construction of a fitting memorial to one of the most outstanding citizens ever to live in Monroe County.

If true citizenship is involvement for the betterment of one's community, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Navarre was an extraordinary citizen. She served Monroe as a

A5138

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 1, 1965

teacher, member of the board of education, librarian, and member of the Monroe County Historical Society. She served the State of Michigan as State librarian and member of the State housing study commission. Mrs. Navarre's life stands as an example of what private citizens dedicated to civic betterment and progress can accomplish. I commend to my colleagues the following excerpts from an article in the Monroe Evening News, and a thoughtful editorial published in the same newspaper:

CIVIC LEADER DIES IN HOME

Mrs. Navarre's failing health curtailed her services on the Monroe Board of Education to which she was elected in 1960 in an unprecedented field of 12 candidates. A strong advocate of improved library facilities in the schools, Mrs. Navarre worked diligently and effectively in improving the school curriculum. She was not a candidate for reelection at the conclusion of her 4 years of service.

She was State librarian from 1933 to 1935, returning to Monroe December 2, 1935, and devoting the better part of the next 13 years to the development of the Monroe County Library. The dedication of the Edward D. Ellis headquarters building on South Custer Road in 1955 manifested the thoroughness of that development under Mrs. Navarre's guidance.

She resigned as county librarian in June 1947, with August 1 as the effective date, but continued to serve on the Michigan State Library Board, being named chairman in December 1955.

Mrs. Navarre was born in Frenchtown Township April 5, 1889, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Stewart. She attended a rural school in Frenchtown and graduated from Monroe High School in 1908, retaining an active interest in the school and its activities throughout her life.

She attended Michigan Agricultural College at East Lansing, now Michigan State University, and graduated from Michigan State Normal College at Ypsilanti, now Eastern Michigan University, with a life certificate in teaching and a bachelor of pedagogy degree.

She taught for 5 years in one- and two-room schools in Monroe County and was principal for a year of the Macomb County Normal School, a training school for rural teachers.

Returning to Monroe, she taught 7 years in the Monroe public schools and was principal for a year of the Lincoln Elementary School, giving her a background which proved of benefit in her years of service on the Monroe Board of Education. Both of her parents were rural school teachers as well as successful farmers.

Her active teaching career concluded in 1928 when a ruling by the board of education here prevented married women from holding teaching jobs. She had married George N. Navarre June 26, 1918, in Monroe.

Mrs. Navarre continued active in the field of education, doing a great amount of substitute teaching and also serving as county school examiner.

She became interested in politics in the early 1930's and became one of the State's best known Democratic women. She served as cochairman of the Monroe County Democratic Committee and her services to the party were responsible for her appointment by Gov. William Comstock as State librarian in August, 1933.

She had helped organize the Jane Jefferson Club of Monroe County and was largely instrumental in bringing Ruth Bryan Owen (later U.S. Ambassador to Denmark) to Monroe during the 1932 political campaign.

Mrs. Navarre's ability as an organizer and as a coordinator of the activities of others,

in addition to her background in teaching and education, made her exceptionally well fitted for the State work. She was often called as a consultant on library matters.

Mrs. Navarre was an advocate of enlarged library services throughout her career and the merger of the Monroe County Library and the Dorsch Memorial Library of Monroe was largely the result of her consistent efforts. She was instrumental in obtaining changes in State law necessary to implement broadened library services.

She was always in the forefront of activities publicizing Monroe County, believing throughout her life in the destiny and development of the county.

One of her projects was the work of the Monroe County Historical Society in enhancing the historical heritage of the region. She took the lead in marking the site of old St. Antoine's Catholic Church on North Custer Road, the first church in the region. The site already had been marked but Mrs. Navarre wanted a more complete marking and a better setting to serve as a symbol of the religious life of the pioneers.

In 1949, Mrs. Navarre was appointed to the State's housing study commission by Gov. G. Mennen Williams. She was named to represent the farm housewife in the work of the commission.

A member of the Monroe County Historical Society since its reactivation in the 1930's, Mrs. Navarre was elected president in January 1962.

A LIFETIME OF DEDICATION

The passing of Mrs. George E. (Lillian Stewart) Navarre will be noted with sorrow by many citizens of the county in which she spent her lifetime.

Few residents, men or women, have maintained over such a long span of years a dedication to citizenship and to the brotherhood of man as did Mrs. Navarre.

As teacher, librarian, club member, historian, and mentor, her life touched countless numbers of county residents through the years. Her interest in the well-being of the county, in the progress of its communities and in its people was unflagging. Her official connections with the schools—as first a teacher and then a school board member—and as a librarian—both at county and State levels—were well known. Her interests in civic projects of all kinds, from community center to community planning, are perhaps lesser known.

She lived her life with constant thought and dedication to the responsibilities of citizenship. She kept herself informed on a wide range of topics—religion, politics, international affairs, civil rights, education and many others. She gave freely of her time for countless causes she regarded as worthwhile to her county or to her community or to her township, serving on many diverse advisory committees during more than half a century of active adult life.

Not only was she a dedicated wife and mother, she was a self-appointed conscience to many of her friends and acquaintances. She took her responsibilities as a citizen seriously, frequently arranging meetings of people she knew whom she felt should be exchanging views on this or that subject of current interest.

Years after most of her contemporaries had retired and left the battle of life to others, Mrs. Navarre continued as fresh and active a role in community affairs as others many years her junior.

An outstanding and permanent memorial to her civic effort is Monroe County's library system. She pioneered the way for its development with relief funds in the early days, later with penal fines money. More recently, her devoted work has been a major factor in planning the East Side library project.

Her sincerity, her purpose, her dedication to the responsibilities of citizenship will long inspire her many friends and acquaintances, young and old.

Peace Corps Volunteer Tom Hale Serving in Niger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 9, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the quality of Massachusetts Peace Corps volunteers has been high in the 4 years during which they have served in all continents of the earth. The latest issue of the Volunteer magazine contains an article by Tom Hale of Lexington, Mass. who is serving under difficult conditions in the recently independent country of Niger.

Tom and his fellow volunteers have done outstanding work in developing improved rural attitudes toward the need for literacy and the use of more modern agricultural techniques. I ask unanimous consent to include the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

C'EST DU PROGRES AU NIGER

(By Tom Hale)

TILLABÉRI, NIGER.—The 43 volunteers who arrived in Niamey last September in the third Peace Corps group to Niger had been told they would be undertaking a difficult assignment. Niger, a landlocked semi-Saharan country, is one of the least developed of West Africa's newly independent nations. The rugged climate and the isolation would combine to undermine the morale of the new volunteers, warned the Peace Corps staff.

After nearly a year the Peace Corps project in Niger is still in good spirits, a little worse for wear but determined to assist in the effort to change the traditions which tie most of Niger's people and her economy to the past.

All illusions volunteers may have had about building tangible symbols of progress have by now been trodden under by the daily routine of teaching nutrition and child care, demonstrating animal-drawn agricultural equipment, or delivering another bundle of booklets to a rural-village adult-literacy class. Most volunteers have managed to adjust to the desert heat, the living conditions in locations sometimes hundreds of kilometers from the nearest town, and the limited variety of local food and high cost of imports, clothing, and hardware in the small but growing capital of Niamey.

In spite of these handicaps volunteers continue their work at upcountry outposts in Niger. And there are some diversions.

For example, hardly a volunteer working with agricultural cooperatives has escaped the shattering arrival of Peace Corps Director C. Payne Lucas at some distant village market. Lucas, a fervent advocate of learning the local language, at first invariably greeted the village chief with a hearty "goodbye" usually in the wrong dialect.

Most volunteers have made a special effort to learn either Hausa or Djerna, and many can handle themselves in any situation with a dialect, while a few speak the local language fluently.

Another problem is the inferiority complex bred by the proximity to Nigeria, a com-